

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5157

lands. A gentleman from the Virgin Islands, Mr. Cyril King, was an assistant of mine. He is now the Governor's secretary in the Virgin Islands. There has been great improvement there in the past 3 years as a result of the Palewonsky administration.

One of the finest things we could do to show we are serious in the war on poverty is to make the Virgin Islands a shining example of what an area or country can be like with helpful administration and programs. This will require the cooperation of the U.S. Government. We are indebted to the Senator from Idaho and other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the leadership shown, but I hope we shall be able to interest all our colleagues in this area, because so many visitors go to the Virgin Islands, not only from the United States, but from all over the world, and it does not look well when they come to the islands to see slums and poverty and lack of education. It looks much better to see what they are given an opportunity to see now—huge existing programs, cleaning out the dirty old slums of cities and villages and better schools.

I have spoken in the high schools in St. Croix and St. Thomas, and I know the effort that is being made to improve education and public health. It is wonderful that we have such men and women willing to give ceaselessly of their time, effort, and ability to this worthy endeavor. It might be added that Governor Palewonsky gave up a substantial personal investment in business in order to assume this responsibility. He has rendered excellent service; and I join in commending him.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. When I hear criticism of the Palewonsky administration in Washington, it is in contrast to what I hear from the people on the wharves and on the streets in the Virgin Islands. It should be better known in Washington that there is now in the Virgin Islands the kind of administration that came some years ago to Puerto Rico under that great statesman, Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín. The progress Governor Palewonsky has been able to make, in a brief period, has been such that we now take foreign visitors from Africa and other underdeveloped regions of the world to the Virgin Islands to show them what is going on under an American administration. There could be no better testimony as to the creative and constructive reform that is being achieved by Governor Palewonsky.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I can confirm fully what the Senator has said about the appreciation and approval of the plain people of the Virgin Islands with what Governor Palewonsky is doing. I have talked with the people along the docks, to taxi drivers, and people in the marketplace; and I found enthusiasm in a region where for many years there was considerable skepticism about our Government among Virgin Islanders. They once felt they had been neglected. They do

not feel that way now. I am convinced that if Congress were to enact the legislation which has been proposed at various times, to give the Virgin Islands an elective Governor, Governor Palewonsky would be elected by an overwhelming majority.

The time is at hand when we should seriously consider such legislation. We have taken the necessary preliminary steps, in that three Governors—two before Governor Palewonsky—have been natives of the Virgin Islands, born and reared there. This is a necessary and desirable preceding step to an elective governorship. I believe the time has come, now that there have been three such Governors, to allow the people of the Virgin Islands to choose their own. I am confident if an election were held today, or in the near future, Governor Palewonsky would win overwhelmingly.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree wholeheartedly. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution.

VIETNAM NEED: WINNING THE PEOPLE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Takashi Oka, the east Asia correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, has long contributed some of the most perceptive reporting on the situation in South Vietnam to be found in the American press. Mr. Oka points out that the Vietnamese conflict is a political war, and that political remedies are needed to win the war against the Vietcong. The primary problem in South Vietnam, Mr. Oka declares, is to win the allegiance of the people in the South Vietnamese countryside.

I ask unanimous consent to have this perceptive article from the March 9 issue of the Monitor, printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VIETNAM NEED: WINNING THE PEOPLE (By Takashi Oka)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—To gain victory in South Vietnam's frustrating war against the Communist guerrillas, there must be a shift in emphasis from killing Communists to winning the people.

This is a view widely shared by Vietnamese and Americans with long experience in combating the Vietcong, the Communist guerrillas.

Trite and worn as the phrase "winning the people" may sound, and as many times as lip service has been paid to this slogan, it is still the irreducible minimum for winning victory, these observers say.

"For 3 years the Pentagon has emphasized military measures—killing the Vietcong," one knowledgeable source commented.

"We've killed thousands of Vietcong, according to our statistics, yet those 45 Vietcong battalions still remain."

"What we have got to do is to get the villagers to defend themselves—motivate them to defend themselves. This will take care of the small unit actions that form the bulk of Vietcong attacks today. Then the regular army can concentrate on the large action—the 300- or 400-men attacks which villagers obviously can't cope with."

The problem is how to motivate the villagers. Some months ago a survey was conducted to determine what a villager actually wanted. The list boiled down to four es-

entials: First, physical security; second, economic opportunity; third, local self-determination; fourth, the rule of law.

It was obvious that the Communists could not provide any of these four requisites except in a limited degree over limited periods of time. It was clear that the Government of South Vietnam as then constituted also failed to perform this task.

But the Government was and is in a far better position to do this than the Communists. And when and as it does, it has a legitimate claim on the loyalty of the villagers.

In another, more recent survey, 33,000 people in a single critical province near Saigon were interviewed. Many grievances against the Government came to light.

But the surveyors found that the interviewees also had an active antipathy toward the Communist guerrillas in their midst. In some villages, interviewees supplied rosters of resident Communists at considerable risk to themselves.

Potentially, therefore, the villagers were not "attentists"—fence sitters. They had definite ideas as to how they wanted the Government to function. And to the extent that the Government actually did function in this manner it could begin to regain ground lost during the final years of the dictatorial Ngo Dinh Diem regime.

As for the argument that the war should be carried to the north, thoughtful observers here say that it sounds like a panacea which does nothing to solve the primary problem—winning the allegiance of the people in the South Vietnamese countryside.

The war must be fought and won in the south, whatever may happen in the north, these observers say. And in their view this war is in the highest sense a political war. Military means are useful only as this basic fact is recognized and applied.

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS M. LYONS, OF BOSTON

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries in its TV column the announcement that Louis M. Lyons, of Boston, has been awarded the Alfred I. du Pont Award for outstanding broadcasting in the public interest.

I am pleased to invite the attention of the Senate to this award, not only because Louis Lyons is a longtime friend of mine, but also because it is the first time the award has been given outside the usual commercial network television routine. Mr. Lyons is chief newscaster and analyst for station WGBH, the educational programing and radio station in the Boston area.

I was pleased to be asked to be a participant on one of his programs several weeks ago, I was urged by friends in the Cambridge-Boston area to accept, because Mr. Lyons was one of the most widely listened to commentators in the entire area.

I have received more mail as a result of that broadcast than from any other broadcast in which I have participated. So I am pleased to see such recognition accorded him.

One of the comments particularly applicable to Mr. Lyons says that his gift of style, his sturdy independence, and his freedom from fashionable cant and his highly personal delivery, make him a rare but winning representative of broadcasting's highest and finest traditions.

I am proud to pay great tribute to Mr. Louis Lyons, and to the integrity and intelligence of the Du Pont Award Committee for making the selection.

BEEF IMPORTS ARE WRECKING OUR LIVESTOCK ECONOMY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, foreign meat products are wrecking our basic livestock economy in the United States. Unless effective action is taken promptly the evil consequences of these imports will have a far greater devastating impact on the overall economy of this country than all of the wars on poverty which this administration may both declare and implement can possibly correct.

Mr. President, it is imperative that corrective action be taken and that this action be fully effective. We are already almost too late on placing the necessary curtailments upon these imports. If we now do too little at this late date we will be guilty of sharply injuring the entire livestock business and its closely associated farming and ranching operations. Many of our businessmen and bankers are also already suffering.

In an effort to be helpful in developing corrective action which will be fully effective, I appeared before the Senate Finance Committee chaired by Senator HARRY BYRD this morning. My testimony will speak for itself, and some of the most important evidence was adduced during the colloquies with various members of the committee during the question-answer period of this morning's testimony. However, since it will be some time before today's committee hearings are printed, I ask unanimous consent that the direct testimony which I presented this morning appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE ON MARCH 16, 1964, IN SUPPORT OF THE AMENDMENT INTRODUCED BY SENATOR HRUSKA AND OTHERS TO REDUCE IMPORTS OF BEEF, VEAL, MUTTON AND LAMB

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I most sincerely appreciate your courtesy and consideration in moving expeditiously to hold hearings on these most important legislative proposals to restrict imports of meat and meat products which are having such an adverse effect on the economy of the American livestock producers. I hope this committee can report this legislation at an early date so that this bill can be brought up on the Senate floor for action at the earliest available opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, this committee is to be commended by the manner in which it has moved through the Congress some of the most important bills of the year. However, I do not feel that any legislative proposal which you have considered or will consider is any more important to the overall economy of all our 50 States than is the proposal which you are considering here today. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I feel that if we are to really wage a war on poverty that an amendment to limit imports of meat and meat products must be considered as a major battle in that war because a sustained continuation of the prevailing, intolerable avalanche of meat imports will create new areas of poverty where none have existed before.

Amendment No. 467, introduced by Senator HRUSKA and others, to H.R. 1839 which is the subject of these hearings today is similar to many other amendments which have been introduced to this same legislative proposal all of which make provision for the placing of limitations on imports of certain livestock products. I am happy to support this amendment since it establishes the year of 1960 as the base for the setting of quotas on these imports. This proposal according to figures which have been made available to me would permit the importation into the country of some 413 million pounds of certain types of meat products. This would be some 610 million pounds below the amount which is now being imported under the Australia-New Zealand agreements formula. Thus amendment 467 is, in my opinion, the most effective and the most desirable of all of the proposals now before you dealing with these emergency conditions created by today's high level of imports.

First of all, let me say I believe that it is unfortunate that this committee must sit here today listening to testimony on legislation to regulate imports of these meat products. I have been deeply disappointed that the administration through the Department of Agriculture and the President have not taken action under authorities at their command to meet this problem head on. I frankly feel that many, many months ago the Secretary of Agriculture should have invoked the emergency provisions of section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1935. For the information of the members of this committee and the record this section contains a provision which reads as follows: "In any case where the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports to the President with regard to any article or article that a condition exists requiring emergency treatment, the President may take immediate action under this section without awaiting the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, such action to continue in effect pending the report and recommendations of the Tariff Commission and action thereon by the President."

While I realize that section 22 applies mainly to price-supported crops, I am convinced that with the imagination of this administration they could have, or still could for that matter, determine that livestock imports would come under this interpretation in view of the fact that the Department buys, every year, meat and meat products for the school-lunch program and for distribution under certain welfare programs—and the dairy support program. In fact, I believe statistics would support the fact that the Secretary has had to buy more dairy products because of beef imports.

The Secretary of Agriculture evidently has not made the emergency recommendations for the imposition of such restrictions and the President has not acted and we are here today making a legislative history with the hope in our hearts that this committee in all its wisdom will report H.R. 1839 with an amendment which will impose fully effective restriction on the imports of meat and meat products and thus provide some encouragement for the future of those in this country who are engaged in livestock production.

Mr. Chairman, the record is replete with statistics on the increase of these imports and the effect which they are having on the economy of our livestock people. However, let me point out that on March 11, 1964, in a publication entitled "Farm Income Situation" issued by the Department of Agriculture it states on page 6 that "Receipts from livestock and livestock products dropped about 2 percent in 1963. This decline was due primarily to lower meat animal prices at the farm." This same publication reports that South Dakota income was down 12 percent in 1963 and again indi-

cates the loss occurred because of declining receipts in the livestock industry. Since about 70 percent of the agriculture income in South Dakota comes from livestock production it is most apparent that our farmers in South Dakota have been seriously hurt economically because of the lack of any effective action to curb these imports. In fact, Mr. Chairman, last year in South Dakota livestock producers suffered a \$56 million devaluation in their assets in livestock alone.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is imperative that this committee and this Congress take expeditious action to approve legislation which would impose needed restrictions. According to Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Roland R. Renne, in an address to the American National Cattleman's Association in Memphis, Tenn., on January 28 of this year he said and I quote: "Today the United States is the only major beef market without any quantitative restrictions and with a very nominal fixed import duty."

Mr. Chairman, here we have an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture saying we are the only major beef market without any quantitative restrictions on imports. We had an opportunity in the Senate on March 5, if we had adopted the Hruska amendment, to have corrected this situation but for reasons which are varied and sundry the Senate failed to adopt that amendment by merger but effective margin of two votes. Had our efforts succeeded then, you would not need to be meeting here today to consider this serious problem which remains unsolved.

We are now taking this route in an attempt to get the job done. The livestock industry is the basic industry of a great segment of our country. The livestockmen are desperate for help against a kind of competition smiled on by the administration which they cannot hope to have corrected without some help from Congress. We who are sponsoring the various amendments providing for these limitations on imports do not ask to have all imports cut off but we do believe that our American producers do have a primary claim on the American market.

Congress in my opinion cannot fall the American livestock producer and I therefore urge this committee to report H.R. 1839 with the necessary amending language such as set forth in amendment No. 467 providing for the imposition of quotas on certain meat imports which will be effective and which will make for an optimistic economic climate in which the livestockmen can operate so that they, too, can then participate in our national economic growth.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in conclusion, may I urge my colleagues in the Senate generally to support legislation which will eliminate the calendar year 1963 entirely from any computation quotas or averages in determining allowable quantities of meat imports to flow into America. After all, we all know that 1963 was the year of the big flood insofar as the inundation of our American markets by foreign meat imports is concerned. Hence, in solving the problem and in setting allowable quotas we should either take the Hruska formula of using the 5 years preceding 1963 as our guide—eliminating the flood tides of 1963 imports entirely in our considerations—or take some near-normal year such as 1960 to determine the allowable level of imports.

In its defeat by two votes of the Hruska amendment to the farm bill which would have set appropriate quotas without further delay, the Senate has contributed to a continuation of a severe economic problem which must be corrected.